



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

knowledge of Latin and Greek forms, will be better attained for just one reason: because we shall be rid of the, omnipresent pressure for time. My plan contemplates that each teacher shall be his own judge of how much shall be covered in the intensive study. The results of the linguistic work will be measured by what his pupils can do, not by what they 'have done'. By setting free twice the classroom time for every home assignment in language work, we shall enable the teacher to uphold a higher ideal. Particularly, if a masterful comprehension of each sentence is insistently demanded, a pupil can not be allowed to slip along without being nailed down to accuracy in his declensions, conjugations, and elementary syntax. Sentence-analysis has been made a little god in its day. I do not countenance that; but in the backswing of the pendulum we have sapped much of the life-blood out of language study.

Elementary sentence-analysis should be a chief subject of instruction and practice in the first year, equally with forms, vocabulary, and a very few peculiarities of the foreign syntax. The art of translation should be taught in the second and subsequent years, not forced down into the preliminary course, as we are doing now,—for instance, in much of our so-called first-year instruction in Latin syntax. There will then be found plenty of opportunity to sharpen the tools of the language before Caesar or Xenophon is begun. And by putting emphasis from the first upon language for its own sake we shall have a progressive course which will benefit in proportion the boy whom economic necessity withdraws at the end of one term equally with the one who continues for nine years.

Finally, we shall cause a great moral uplift. For we shall terminate the omnipresent temptation of the pupil to pretend that he has gotten the meaning of a sentence by individual study when in fact he has ascertained it from a pony; because the conscious purpose will no longer be the getting of the meaning.

In a word let me summarize that our high-pressure system in the study of Latin and Greek and our increasing dearth of good results is the product of our failure, in the adaptation of ancient language courses to external changes, to keep distinct the two motive causes which I have tried herein to differentiate.

BARCLAY W. BRADLEY.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

CAESAR DE BELLO GALLICO 2.11

It is a view all too frequently held that certain Latin authors constitute fields that have been so thoroughly cultivated that further tillage will yield no results. It is none the less true that in the most widely studied authors, such as Caesar, Vergil and Horace, many points yet await solution, and many

passages have not received proper analysis and interpretation. One of these is to be found in Caesar De Bello Gallico 2.11. The Remi, repulsed in their attempt to dislodge Caesar from his fortified position, have determined to return to their homes (see Chapters 9-10). At the second watch of a certain night they set forth; Caesar learns of their movement at once, but, inasmuch as he does not immediately fathom its meaning, he keeps his own men in camp till daybreak. Then he sends cavalry and legions in pursuit. Now comes the passage which forms the theme of this note: *Hi novissimos adorti et multa milia passuum prosecuti magnam multitudinem eorum fugientium conciderunt, cum ab extremo agmine, ad quos ventum erat, consistentes fortiterque impetum nostrorum militum sustinerent, priores, quod abesse a periculo viderentur neque ulla necessitate neque imperio continerentur, exaudito clamore perturbatis ordinibus omnes in fuga sibi praesidium ponerent.*

Various questions at once arise: What is the force of *cum*? what verb does it introduce? The only note in Professor Kelsey's edition that helps here at all runs thus: "*cum....consisterent*: 'since (those) on the rear of the line of the march, to whom (the Romans) had come, were making a stand'". Messrs. Harper and Tolman translate *cum....consisterent* by "while those in the rear, to whom our men had come up, were standing firm". They ask the pupil, further, to supply *et* before *priores*! Messrs. Lowe and Ewing sang the same song, 'Since those in the rear of the (Belgian) army, whom (our men) had overtaken, were making a stand'. In the galley proofs of their Second Year Latin Book Messrs. Miller and Beeson had interpreted *cum....consisterent* exactly as others had done, and had then written the following note: "*(et) priores (hostes)*: 'and (since) the van of the enemy'". In reading the proofs of that book for the authors I questioned this view and suggested the view which I shall give in full below. Their work, as finally printed, shows these two notes: "*Cum....consisterent*: 'since (only) those in the extreme rear, whom our men had overtaken, were making a stand'", and "*priores (hostes)*, etc: this clause, though having the same construction as the preceding subjunctives, is balanced off against them. Tr. 'while the van of the enemy', etc."

Why did editor after editor content himself with merely translating the *cum....consisterent* clause, without stopping to review the sentence as a whole? The ordinary notes here make Caesar say that the Romans killed a great host of the Belgians as they were running away because the rearguard made a stand!!! Strange doctrine, surely! Why did they

¹ I trust a reference will be pardoned to the American Journal of Philology 31.72, Note 1, where I have protested against the failure of modern editors to read in the large, the tendency "to curtail the comprehensive ancient sentence and to fail to grasp it as a whole".

not remind themselves that the massacres of foemen of which Caesar speaks so often occur while the foe are running away, not while they are making a brave stand?

The true explanation of our passage is this: we have here in the *cum* clause two ideas contrasted one with the other, in a fashion which Greek, superior here vastly to Latin, would have brought out with absolute clearness with the help of *μέν* and *δέ* "They assailed the rear and having attended them (there is perhaps a bit of grim humor in *prosecuti*: cf. Cicero Cat. 2.1) many miles slew a host of them, because, *though* the rearguard stood their ground and manfully sustained the attack of our force, the van...looked on flight as its one and only safety". Caesar is but giving a hint to the (military) wise. We are to fill out that hint by inferring that but a part of the Roman force was needed to fight the manly rearguard, while the rest of the Romans press on and butcher the fugitive van. If this view is correct, then it follows at once that every note (even that of Messrs. Miller and Beeson) which lays stress on the connection of *cum* with *consisterent* is false and misleading. *Formally*, *cum* does belong with *consisterent* and *sustinerent*, yet in point of sense, at least to my feeling, its connection is rather with *ponerent* and with that alone. *ab extremo agmine*, which contains within itself, virtually, a substantival element subject of *consisterent*, and *priores* are sharply opposed one to the other¹.

A passage somewhat similar to this occurs in De Bello Gallico 1.20, in the speech of Diviciacus: scire se illa esse vera nec quemquam ex eo plus quam se doloris capere, propterea quod, cum ipse gratia plurimum domi atque in reliqua Gallia, ille minimum propter adulescentiam posset, per se crevisset, etc. Messrs. Kelsey, Lowe and Ewing, Harper and Tolman all pass *cum* by without comment. But the passage surely means, "because at a time when though he himself (Div.) was extremely influential at home and abroad, the other (Dum.) had no power because of his youth". In a word, here again we have a *μέν-δέ* combination, though I grant that this is a simpler case, because there is nothing repugnant to our feeling here in coupling *cum* with both subjunctives, since both can be treated as circumstantial. My point is, of course, that editor and teacher should bring out here clearly the fact that the clauses *ipse...Gallia* and *ille...posset* are sharply contrasted each to each. C. K.

FOR TEACHERS OF CAESAR

In the sixth volume of his *Survey of London*, entitled *Early London: Prehistoric, Roman, Saxon*,

¹ The foregoing note has been among my papers for many years. The *Second Year Latin Book* by Messrs. Miller and Beeson appeared in (1902). I am glad to note that Mr. Hodges in his recent edition of *Caesar* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.132) treats the passage rightly.

and Norman (Macmillan, 1908: \$7.50 net) Sir Walter Besant discusses matters of interest to classical students. We subjoin part of a review of the book which appeared in *The Nation* of November 26, 1908 (though somewhat belated, this note may not wholly lack value; books at \$7.50 are not for every teacher of Classics).

How did London come by its name? Did it exist at the time of Caesar's invasion of Britain, and, if so, how is it that he has not mentioned it? Sir Walter Besant contends that, "while London was as yet only a rude hill-fortress, perhaps while it was only a village of lake-dwellers in the marsh, perhaps before it came into existence at all", there was a busy and thriving community higher up the Thames, at Thorney Island, the future site of Westminster Abbey. This explanation we need to account for the fact that the great road from Dover and Canterbury to St. Albans did not touch London, but went through Westminster at Thorney Island. Sir Walter Besant's view that there was here a ford has been strongly contested, but we are not compelled to accept the ford, for a ferry would preserve continuity for the route over the river, as well as a ford, or even better. London was either not in existence, or was not worthy of so much as mention in 55 B. C., when Caesar invaded Britain; Dion Cassius, who tells the story of the invasion in A. D. 43, is also silent as to London. The question is how to reconcile all this with the fact that Tacitus, writing of A. D. 61, eighteen years later than Dion, describes London as a great and populous place. Sir Walter Besant's solution of the difficulty is that the importance of London was due solely to a great annual fair. This seems to go far towards reconciling facts in seeming contradiction. During the period of the Roman occupation of Britain, London rose to be a place of great importance.

We come now to a most obscure part in the history of London. After the departure of the Romans, the city was ravaged by Saxon pirates and fell into decay: in two hundred years it is mentioned once only, and then merely as a place of retreat of fugitive Britons. "London", says Sir Walter, "was absolutely deserted—as deserted as Baalbec or Tadmor in the Wilderness—and she so continued for something like a hundred and fifty years". This view is not universally accepted: G. L. Gomme, for instance, has in his *Governance of London* contended with all the weight of his learning that after the departure of the Romans London remained essentially Roman in constitution. This view, it is needless to say, is wholly incompatible with the assumption of the desertion of London.

Reference may be made here to T. Rice Holmes's monumental work on *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar*, pages 255, 703-705.

It very frequently happens that books whose titles are in no way suggestive, at least directly, of the Classics, after all are full of interest for the classical student. Publishers have such an ineradicable habit of knowing little about the books they present to the public that books of this type rarely find their way to the editorial desk. Hence I have not seen a book entitled *The History of England* (Volume I: *England Before the Norman Conquest*: G. P. Put-